

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ news release

The days when a courageous President could win great conservation victories alone--reserving a national forest system by the stroke of a pen--are over. The pressures of a growing industrial society press heavily on our resources;

competition for land and water increases; hard choices and vast public and private expenditures are now the instruments of conservation progress. But I believe the philosophy and the program laid out by President Kennedy, in his special message, can make the 60's an "Age of Action" if we are equal to the challenge.

The President's philosophy is clear-cut:

"Conservation...can be defined as the wise use of our national environment; it is, in the final analysis, the highest form of national thrift--the prevention of waste and despoilment while preserving, improving, and renewing the quality and usefulness of all our resources."

This is a program worthy of the challenge--a conservation action program which recognizes the essential unity of man and resources and calls for a coordinated effort by all citizens and all interests to assure water, power, timber, minerals, forage, productive soil, and an inspiring natural environment for the numberless generations to come.

Our special concern today is in outdoor America: in how we can provide opportunities for fishing, hunting, camping, and boating, preserve places of scenic grandeur, hold open spaces against the sprawl of suburbia.

I think the record of the past year--since President Kennedy dedicated the National Wildlife Federation Building a year ago March 3--demonstrates that the Nation is prepared for the "Age of Action". In the last twelve months,

- the Congress approved a long-range program for acquisition of refuges and production areas for migratory waterfowl;

- the Congress confirmed its concern for clean water by strengthening the Water Pollution Control Act;

- a Federal grant program to help communities win the race for open space was established in the Housing Act of 1961;

- the Cape Cod National Seashore was established;

- the Department of Defense opened the way to increased public use of military lands in a February 16 order outlining procedures for cooperative fish and wildlife management and protection plans;

- appropriate tracts of Bureau of Land Management lands needed for State and local park and recreation purposes are being made available by the Department of the Interior at the nominal price of \$2.50 per acre;

--my Department is entering into agreements with State fish and game agencies for Federal-State cooperative land and wildlife management areas--eight such areas, ranging in size from 22,000 to 300,000 acres, are now covered by agreements with California;

--a new Federal Pest Control Review Board is attempting to harmonize pest control programs with protection of human and fish and wildlife values;

--single interest domination of the national advisory board on Bureau of Land Management lands has been ended;

--the Department of Agriculture has proposed an imaginative 10-year "Development Program for the National Forests;"

--Secretary Freeman and I have made substantial progress in working out protection for waterfowl production areas threatened by drainage programs.

I also think we can all join in saluting the National Park Service for completing its planned elk reduction program in Yellowstone National Park in the face of opposition by misinformed people who refused to accept the necessity for any reduction, and by others--including many of you--who concurred in the goal but objected to the methods. Regardless of honest differences of opinion, the North Yellowstone herd has been reduced, and a serious threat to the ecological integrity of the park diminished.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the significance of the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Senator Anderson will report personally to the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference next week. I will say only that I have studied the report thoroughly, and find it a sound basis for the kind of cooperative national effort we must make if our national landscape is to be preserved and people are to have the opportunity to enjoy it.

We can take solid satisfaction, I believe, in the progress registered in 1961. But if the year was distinguished for what was accomplished--and much of the progress was the culmination of years of perseverance--it was also distinguished by what was only begun.

As far as my Department is concerned, the first order of unfinished conservation business for 1962 is the enactment of a sound wilderness bill, free of further crippling amendments.

There are other major items of unfinished business:

--S. 543, Senator Anderson's shorelines bill, which would launch a study of shoreline areas by Interior and Agriculture, and help the States acquire needed areas (approved by the Senate);

--S. 1988, the bill introduced by Senator Kuchel to preserve the Tulelake--Klamath refuges;

--H.R. 8520, the bill to protect wetlands in Federally assisted drainage programs (approved by the House);

--bills to establish Point Reyes National Seashore and Great Basin National Park (both have passed the Senate); and other pending bills on individual areas, including Sleeping Bear Dunes National Seashore, Ozark-Rivers National Monument, Canyonlands National Park, Prairie National Park, Padre Island National Seashore, a National Lakeshore Area in northern Indiana and Sagamore Hill National Historic Site in New York;

--S. 404, the Youth Opportunities Employment Act, which includes the Youth Conservation Corps;

--S. 2246, the Water Resources Planning Act.

In addition to items which the Congress has considered, a list of specific new legislation would include:

--legislation to recognize recreation as a purpose of Bureau of Reclamation water projects, and authorizing the Bureau to maintain and operate recreation facilities and acquire additional lands for recreation use;

--a supplemental appropriation to the Bureau of Land Management to begin the development of the vast and substantially untapped recreation potential of the Bureau of Land Management lands;

--H.R. 7404 (by Congressman Dingell) to permit the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to develop recreation facilities on National Wildlife Refuges, both to provide for compatible public recreation use and to control the increasing hordes who use the refuges for recreation.

--amendments to surplus property laws to end the requirement that only lands "chiefly valuable" for fish and wildlife can be transferred to the States for those purposes, and to ease the financial terms on surplus property for park and recreation purposes.

--legislation--provided in the Administration farm bill--to encourage recreation and fish and wildlife use of acres not needed for agricultural production.

This list of unfinished and new business, if enacted into law by the Congress, can make 1962 far and away the finest year of accomplishment in conservation history. But even these specific issues, if all were approved, fall short of the challenge and opportunity.

The report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and the president's Special Message on Conservation call for the establishment of new national policy in recreation.

The Commission recommended, and the President has endorsed, the establishment of an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council consisting of the heads of the major Federal departments and agencies. This Advisory Council would provide broad policy guidance to achieve consistency in the multiplicity of Federal agencies--over 20--whose activities significantly affect outdoor recreation.

To make the policy guidance meaningful, ORRRC recommended, and the President has endorsed, the establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior to work with other agencies in carrying out the broad policies recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council.

The President will establish the Council by executive order. I will establish the Bureau under authorities available to me, and will ask the Congress for additional legislation to fully implement the ORRRC recommendation.

We see the Council and the Bureau as the means by which recreation and fish and wildlife will finally be given a seat at the head table in the Federal Government, and we trust that both will have the wholehearted support and cooperation of all conservation interests, public and private.

In addition to making sense out of Federal recreation efforts, the Council and the Bureau are to build a cooperative local-State-Federal outdoor recreation effort.

The States are now responding dramatically to the challenge to assume a greater burden of the outdoor recreation job. Governor Nelson in Wisconsin, Governor Rockefeller in New York, former Governor Meyner and Governor Hughes in New Jersey, Governor Brown in California, Governor Lawrence in Pennsylvania, are actually showing the way, in their long-range outdoor recreation programs, that other States--and the Federal Government--should follow.

The limiting factor on State effort has been money. In recognition of this fact, the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission recommended Federal grants to the States for development of comprehensive State outdoor recreation plans and for acquisition and development of land and water areas.

The President asked the Congress to approve the grant program for planning in this session. After an interval to get the planning program underway, it is our intention to consider proposals for companion grants for State land acquisition and development to activate a massive assault on the crisis in outdoor recreation. This is making full creative use of the powers of all levels of government.

It is clear that the Nation is being asked to double and redouble expenditures for outdoor recreation--and at a time when the Federal budget is strained to meet the demands of national defense and too-long delayed domestic programs in housing, education, medical care and other investments in national strength.

Out of the deep conviction that those who now enjoy the outdoors are willing to share the burden of expanding recreation opportunities for the present and for the future, the President has proposed the establishment of a Land Conservation Fund to finance an eight-year program--through Fiscal Year 1970--for the acquisition of lands for conservation and recreation purposes.

The Fund would be supported by receipts from recreation user charges, including, in all likelihood, an auto sticker for recreation use of Federal land and water areas. Other financing sources include the refundable two cents per-gallon tax on gasoline used in recreational boating; receipts from the sale of surplus Federal non-military real property; and by annual user charges on recreational boats. The Congress will be asked to authorize an advance of \$500 million to the Fund, to be repaid out of the dedicated revenues.

Press coverage of the President's special message has emphasized use of the Fund for acquisition of new National Park areas. I want to make it clear that the Fund would be used also for acquisition of wildlife refuges for the preservation of endangered species; and by the Department of Agriculture for acquisition of lands--including key recreation and fish and wildlife lands--to round out the National Forest System.

In addition, development of the tremendous recreation and fish and wildlife potential of Federal and federally assisted water development projects would be supported indirectly from the fund. This would be facilitated by depositing a portion of Fund revenues into the Treasury to assist acquisition of additional lands for recreation and fish and wildlife at projects of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation projects, and at small watershed projects of the Soil Conservation Service which are open to the public.

Finally, we are hopeful that the prospective program of grants to States for recreation land acquisition can be financed through the Fund.

Congressional and public approval of the Fund would provide a means of accomplishing the one objective on which the future of outdoor recreation opportunity depends: acquiring, ahead of the bulldozer and the dragline and in advance of skyrocketing prices--the remaining areas, grand and modest in scale, which will serve the outdoor recreation needs of the future.

Nothing else we may do can meet the rising tide of demand for outdoor opportunity if we fail to assure permanent public access to an adequate and diverse network of public recreation areas.

The philosophy and the program I have outlined are essential to preservation of the national heritage. I would like to emphasize that we who place high value on this objective must do so in a context that recognizes fully the need for other products of land and water than the inspiration and exhilaration of outdoor enjoyment.

Timber, minerals, forage, water for cities, industry and agriculture, land for the inevitable expansion of facilities for a growing population--these needs must be met. We will be well advised to conduct our outdoor recreation programs in a spirit--which I know is central to the philosophy of the National Wildlife Federation--that our land is big enough and diverse enough to meet both the material and the spiritual and esthetic needs of our people; and that the cause of conservation is better served by honest compromise than by single-minded zeal in dealing with those whose businesses depend on our basic resources.

Within the conservation movement, there is also urgent need for a spirit of compromise.

Boaters and fishermen find themselves at odds over the use of limited water services. Wilderness proponents find themselves at odds with recreationists who want to drive, not walk, to the quiet places that are now beyond the road's end. And hunters and traditional park enthusiasts are too frequently at loggerheads over the place of recreational hunting in lands under administration of the National Park Service.

Let me state it bluntly:

The great national effort to preserve and develop outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife resources to meet the demands of the 20th Century will succeed only if we can maintain a united conservation front--differing in specifics, perhaps, but never yielding to the temptation to destroy the whole by trying to assure a special advantage to any part.

I am most concerned about the splintering of effort behind the great land acquisition program over the issue of hunting in areas administered by the National Park Service.

I believe it is unquestionable that hunters will benefit tremendously from the total recreational lands program.

The rounding out of the National Forest System will add significantly to hunting opportunity by acquisition of access points and key habitat and public use areas.

The acquisition of additional lands at Federal water development projects--assisted by the recreation land policy and the Land Conservation Fund will assure protection of critical habitat and public shooting space on the vast and growing Federal reservoir systems.

And I want to emphasize that the net result of addition of new areas to the management of the National Park Service will extend, not diminish, hunting opportunities.

Seven of the 12 currently active proposals for new areas are National Seashores or Lakeshores. The Department has made it clear that, where hunting has been a significant use of these areas, it will be recognized and continued as a desirable recreation use. The coming years will see establishment of a number of National Recreation Areas--at Federal water development projects--and at other areas where the primary national interest is in intensive public recreation use. Unless there is a compelling reason to the contrary, hunting will continue to be permitted on National Recreation Areas.

Even in those areas traditionally banned to hunting, the loss is not so great as one might think.

I believe that much of the concern--and it is genuine and understandable--on the part of State game administrators can be traced to misunderstandings about the acreage we hope to acquire as National Parks and Monuments.

Actually, the National Park Service program for the 1960's prepared for me in developing the Land Conservation Fund proposal calls for the addition of new areas totaling just over 4,300,000 acres. A substantial part of that acreage is for National Seashore and National Recreation Areas in which hunting is far more likely to be permitted than banned.

When you consider that public hunting opportunities presently available at Point Reyes, Sleeping Bear, and other National Seashores, and at such potential National Recreation Areas as Tocks Island in New Jersey and Pennsylvania and Between-the-Rivers in Kentucky and Tennessee, will be gradually diminished through posting of private property as pressures mount over the years, I believe it is clear that over the long haul hunting opportunities will actually be extended by the total National Park Service acquisition program.

Nonetheless, the matter has been a subject of controversy long enough, in my opinion; and I am therefore asking a distinguished group of citizens representative of park and wildlife interests and of the general public to study the matter, and to give me recommendations which I hope will provide the basis for a solution acceptable to all concerned. I will announce the membership of this group within the next few weeks.

In the meantime, I ask--as I have asked before--that both sides in the National Park hunting issue refrain from demanding a far-reaching, rigid decision until the study is completed and all the facts are in. By studying

each area individually, I believe we can make reasoned determinations on the uses to be permitted in each area--including hunting--that will yield the greatest returns to the public.

If we can resolve the wasting controversies that divide us, agree on a philosophy and the broad outlines of a program, I am convinced we can win the battle for a decent outdoor heritage for our people.

In these remarks I have emphasized those things that government proposes to or ought to do. That is inevitable from a public official; and it may be especially so from me because of the intense effort of the past few weeks in developing the program I have outlined today.

But the ultimate decision rests not with me, nor with the President, nor with the Congress, but with the American public.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of citizen conservation organizations--of the National Wildlife Federation--in shaping the ultimate decision.

The great accomplishments of a democratic society are responses to public need and opinion, not the products of visionaries--or even men of vision--in public office.

The National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, the Audubon Society, the League of Women Voters--these and other organizations grappling responsibly with the conservation of our resources--are the catalysts which inspire the effective expression of public opinion. In point of fact, much of the best of the program we now sponsor was conceived by the National Wildlife Federation and your allies in the conservation movement.

I can't overstress the importance we place on the leaders and staffs of the conservation organizations. The day-to-day guidance and counsel we receive from the people like Tom Kimball is an indispensable part of our job of managing the national resource conservation program. Inspiration and imagination are hard to find in the details that make so much of the life of the governmental administrator--these are the vital ingredients that must be supplied by the "Ding" Darlings and other men of real vision.

I do not ask your uncritical approval of all that we propose. I do ask you to study the President's message and the legislation to implement it as it goes before the Congress; to give us your counsel on how the programs may be approved; and to support those which in good conscience you can.

The date of the White House Conference on Conservation will be announced soon. By the time it convenes, the issues before the Congress in acting on the Land Conservation Fund, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the individual park bills, the grants to States for recreation planning, will have sharpened.

I am confident that the citizen conservation movement will be represented at the Conference, prepared to help in shaping the final drive for Congressional action in this session on a program which will determine the face of the Nation and influence the character of its people for decades to come.

X X X